



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,571	09/15/2003	Teodor Zlatkov Zlatanov	11420-003-999	4195
20583	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017		HILLERY, NATHAN		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/663,571	ZLATANOV ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 14-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 14-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 3/21/06.
2. Claims 14 – 20 are pending in the case. Claim 14 is independent.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, see pp 7 - 10, filed 3/21/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 14 – 17 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Gershoff et al. (US 20020120596A1).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the database" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the database" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2176

8. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the database" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claims 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the nexus between the claimed system and tables and the claimed database. It is unclear how they might all fit together. Specifically, because there are many different tables recited, it is unclear whether or not all of the tables are located in the database or just some of the tables and whether or not the database simply coexists with the tables in the system.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 14, and 16 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gershoff et al. (20020120596).

12. Regarding independent claim 14, Gershoff et al. teach that In FIG. 2, the layout for the manual table is provided with four columns, which includes an auto-number id field to establish an absolute identity, a name column for a descriptive text string, a field to date-time stamp the row creation, and an id of the root procedure, which is the initial procedure of the manual (even a parent manual has an id of the root procedure). The id of the root procedure is the starting point for the manual (paragraph block 0054), which is equivalent to the claimed **a layout table that includes a row for storing an identity of said layout and an identity of the top split in said hierarchy of splits**. It should be noted that the manual table of Gershoff et al. is equivalent to the claimed **layout table**; id field to the claimed **identity of said layout**; the id of the root procedure to the claimed **identity of the top split**.

13. Gershoff et al. teach that a similar concept to inheritance is the notion of nested procedures. Each manual is comprised of a set of order procedures. Each procedure may have any number of nested procedures (child procedures). When a blank manual is created, a new procedure is also created and its id for the procedure is placed into the manual table in the id of the root procedure field. All new procedures that are added to the manual are a child of the root procedure. Unlike manual inheritance, there is no table that explicated defines this relationship. Instead, a new procedure is a piece of content of the parent procedure. The id of the content field maps to a record in the content table (FIG. 9) that indicates the type of content it is, in this case it is a procedure. This tells the system to look into the ContProc table (FIG. 4) and find the id

of the procedure field that is associated with the current id of the content value (paragraph block 0073), which is equivalent to the claimed **a layoutdata table that includes a row for each split in said hierarchy of splits, wherein each respective split stored in said layoutdata table comprises: (i) a parent field that specifies the parent split of the respective split; and (ii) a type field that specifies whether the respective split is a data split and, when the respective split is not a data split, defines an orientation of the respective split within the parent split of the respective split.** It should be noted that the content table of Gershoff et al. is equivalent to the claimed **layoutdata table**; the content to the claimed **split**; the id of the content field, which is associated with the id of the procedure field, to the claimed **parent field**; the type of the content field to the claimed **type field**; the procedure to the claimed **not data split**.

14. Gershoff et al. further teaches that FIG. 11 illustrates the layout of the ContText table wherein id of the text is an auto-number ID field to establish an absolute identity for each row, id of the content relates to the id of the content field of FIG. 9. FIG. 12 illustrates the layout of the ContImages table wherein id of an image is an auto-number ID field to establish an absolute identity for each row, id of the content relates to the id of the content field of FIG. 9 (paragraph blocks 0064 & 0065). It should be noted that the text, image, etc of Gershoff et al. is equivalent to the claimed **data split**.

15. **Regarding dependent claims 16 and 17**, Gershoff et al. teach that FIG. 9 shows the layout of the Content table wherein id of the content is an auto-number ID

field to establish an absolute identity for each row, type of the content provides a numerical field, id of data is the value of the primary key in the associated content type tables (CONTTEXT, CONTIMAGE, etc.). The system looks at the type of the content field to determine which data table to use. The data id can then be used to match the content to the data. When a piece of content gets edited or deleted a new row in the content table is created. The id of the edit in the new row contains the id of the content of the edited content. Then the id of the content field in the ProcContent table is updated with the new id of the content. ID of the edit incrementally increases in numeric value so that changes to content may be rolled back, and attribute as XML holds various display characteristics of the content in XML (paragraph blocks 0061 & 0062), which is equivalent to the claimed **a views table for storing a different view for each data split in said split hierarchy, wherein each said different view references an object; an objects table for storing each said referenced object; and an object in said objects table is a text object, a blog object, or a gallery object.** It should be noted that the content table of Gershoff et al. is equivalent to the claimed **views table;** the image or text to the claimed **object;** the ContText table to the claimed **objects table,** thus the text represented in the ContText table is equivalent to the claimed **object is a text object.**

16. **Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19,** Gershoff et al. teach that FIG. 9 shows the layout of the Content table wherein id of content is an auto-number ID field to establish an absolute identity for each row, type of content provides a numerical field, id

of data is the value of the primary key in the associated content type tables (CONTTEXT, CONTIMAGE, etc.). The system looks at the type of content field to determine which data table to use. The data id can then be used to match the content to the data. When a piece of content gets edited or deleted a new row in the content table is created. The id of edit in the new row contains the id of content of the edited content. Then the id of content field in the [ProcContent] table is updated with the new id of content. ID of edit incrementally increases in numeric value so that changes to content may be rolled back, and attribute as XML holds various display characteristics of the content in XML (paragraph blocks 0061 & 0062), which is equivalent to the claimed **the object is a blog object and the object is a gallery object**. Within the broadest, reasonable interpretation, it should be noted that the ContText table is equivalent to the claimed **objects table, wherein the object is a blog object**; and that the ContImage table is equivalent to the claimed **objects table, wherein the object is a gallery object** (of images).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

18. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershoff et al. (20020120596) as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Dees (US Published application 2003 / 0137539).

19. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, Gershoff et al. do not explicitly teach that **the orientation is horizontal or vertical**.

20. Gershoff et al. do teach that XML attributes hold various display characteristics of the content in XML (Fig 9 & paragraph block 0062).

21. Dees teach that the portrait and landscape tags can define the style attributes of layout and orientation of elements (p 7, table) and that the orientation in which elements can be drawn are either horizontal or vertical (p 8, first table).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Gershoff et al. with that of Dees because such a combination would provide the users of Gershoff et al. with the benefit of a method which allows for more effective processing of style information (p 1, paragraph block 0010).

23. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershoff et al. (20020120596) as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Marca (US 5050074 A).

24. **Regarding dependent claim 20**, Gershoff et al. do not explicitly teach that **the database further comprising an actions table for storing each operation on said layout that is performed by a user**.

25. Marca teaches that the processing module retrieves the identified object from the object database and determines its state. Using the identified state, the processing module then, using the state/action table, identifies the actions that can be performed in connection with the object. The processing module identifies the actions associated with the flags that are set in the action flag fields in the entry associated with the state identified by the contents of the state field. If the storage module contains a plurality of state/action tables each associated with one or more selected objects, the processing module will use the state/action table associated with the object in this operation (Column 7, lines 30 – 50), which is equivalent to the claimed **the database further comprising an actions table for storing each operation on said layout that is performed by a user.**

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gershoff et al. with that of Marca because such a combination would provide the users of Gershoff et al. with a *new and improved system, used in conjunction with a computer, for coordinating activities by a plurality of actors within a common operation having multiple constituents* (Column 1, lines 45 – 48).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Doug Hutton  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

NH

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100